

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/662,368	09/16/2003	Yoshitarou Yazaki	01-241-DIV	9414
23400	7590 02/13/2006		EXAMINER	
	GROUP, PLC		ARBES, CARL J	
12040 SOUT SUITE 101	H LAKES DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESTON, V	'A 20191		3729	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		XX	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,368	YAZAKI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C. J. Arbes	3729	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	ne correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	OATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e, cause the application to become ABAND	ION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 £	December 2005.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ince except for formal matters,	prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under the	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 6-15 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 6-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to by the	ne Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	= ' '		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applic ority documents have been rece u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date herein.	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:		

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/662,368

Art Unit: 3729

Claims 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Claim 6 Applicants recite ...interconnecting electrically a plurality of conductor patterns with a unified conductive compound... The Office wishes to have Applicants clarify which is meant by ...with a unified conductive compound.. such that it is meaningful to one of ordinary skill in the art; furthermore in clams 6 relating to the language ... the conductive compound, which is adjacent to an area contacting the conductor pattern, ... Applicants are requested to clarify this language such that a POSITA would have little or no difficulty in understanding this language and therefore the claimed invention; furthermore in the same (or last indent) of claim 6 Applicants recite ... such a manner that the farther from the conductor patterns on the side wall... is not clear and therefore Applicants atre advised to amend such language so that the claimed invention does particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 6-8, as understood are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being (of Record) anticipated by Sasaoka et al. (Pat No. 6,010769); hereinafter Sasaoka et al. This prior

Application/Control Number: 10/662,368 Page 3

Art Unit: 3729

art document speaks for itself for all that is disclosed therein. The Examiner moreover has also briefly provided additional information *infra* to insure or make it easier for Applicants to grasp the content in Sasaoka et al.

Claims 9-15, as understood, are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaoka et al. Sasaoka et al teach a wiring board comprising an insulating film (11b) which has wiring layers (12a and 13a) or conductor patterns. Conductive pillars (14) which can be made from conductive resin or conductive paste (Cf. Col 15) pierces the insulating layer (Col 15) and is used to interconnect conductive patterns on major surfaces of a wiring board. The insulative layer and the conductive layer are pressed with heat such that the a portion of the conductive pillar protrudes into the vias and the via walls are caused to be deformed (Cf. Col 24). The shape of the resultant wall deformation is such as is seen in e.g. Figures 1, 4, 5, 8, 9A, 11A and B, 13 A and B, 14 D,E,F, G, H, 18, 19B, C, D, E, F, G, 22 and 23, that is, there is an arch shape in a cross sectional plane passing through the center axis of a via hole as result of this process. It would have been obvious to a POSITA to use materials such that the volume of the conductive material is reduced relative to the volume of the interlayer material. This would be so since the specific volume of the conductive material is crystalline with corresponding lower specific volume vis a vis a relative higher specific volume of any polymeric material (which is a super-cooled glass). That is the polymer compound. Would have higher specific volume do to the longer molecular chains and hence requires relatively more volume than the conductive material. One can almost say with a high degree of certainty that the limitation in claim 9 is inherent in the choice

Application/Control Number: 10/662,368

Art Unit: 3729

of materials As applied to claims 10 and 13-15 it is held that the numerical limitations I these claims a would each have been obvious to a POSITA given the evidence in Sasaoka et al. Alternatively these limitations are held to be design choice inasmuch as Applicants do not disclose any specific problem which is solved or any particular purpose therefore. As applied to claim11 it is noted at least in Col. 28 that metal particles can be used for the interlayer connecting process. As applied to claim 12 it is held to have been obvious to provide that the melting points of the conductor patterns would have to be higher that the melting temperature of the interconnecting layer since one would almost never want or desire the conductive patterns to melt before or during the time when the interlayer conductive material is being processed to provide a solid and effective interconnection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. J. Arbes whose telephone number is 571-272-4563. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, R and F from 8 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Vo, can be reached on 571-272-4563. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/662,368 Page 5

Art Unit: 3729

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. J. Arbes

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3729